



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

character—an impression which was not belied by their answers to the questions submitted to them. Looking at the work done by this court, and the satisfaction expressed by both sides at its judgment, a disinterested observer is impressed with the idea that a successful disposition of a long standing dispute has precluded almost the possibility of a war with Great Britain.

Obviously some method must be found of enforcing obedience to the decree of an international court. This can only be done directly in two ways. First, by the victorious party using its own army and navy and virtually carrying on a war, which it was the very object of the arbitration to avoid; or, second, by the establishment of an international force large enough to compel the submission of the defeated party. There are so many obstacles to the exercise of such a power in cases where but one or two nations are interested, so many natural jealousies to be surmounted in carrying out the decree, that it can hardly be regarded as a practicable method of enforcement.

The creation of a world-wide public opinion strong enough to curb the warlike propensities of particular nations seems to me our only reliance in the present state of civilization. Such progress as has already been made in this direction has been the result of an increasing conviction of the uselessness of wars and an increasing belief that in the blessings of peace is to be found the true grandeur of nations. A stable public opinion is usually a matter of slow growth; but, in view of what has already been accomplished, we may be hopeful, though not sanguine, that very much more may be done and a peace sentiment established which will ultimately sweep the whole world into its embrace. Wars for trivial causes have already practically ceased between civilized nations. May we not contemplate the awakening of a public sentiment that even emperors, kings and ministries may not defy? The first step in this direction must be the limitation of armaments by treaty. So long as the great powers of Europe persist in multiplying their Dreadnaughts and in training every man as a soldier liable to be called upon for immediate service, employment must be found for them to justify their existence. The world will not continue to burden itself with the enormous expense of modern armaments without an occasional showing of its necessity. While there may be some truth in the adage that a readiness for war is an assurance of peace, there is another side to the proposition,—an instant preparedness for war by one nation invites a coalition of powers to resist it, which will ultimately bring on a general war. This was the case in Napoleon's time, when the readiness of France for war brought on a combination of European states resulting in the ultimate destruction of the dynasty.

To such efforts as this and kindred societies may be able to make,—to a gradually increasing pressure of public opinion upon the leading statesmen of Europe,—the world may yet, in the progress of time, be brought to adjust its difficulties upon the basis of an enlightened judicial settlement.

The first workingmen's Peace Society in Italy has just been organized at Milan with eighteen thousand members. The names of the signers were secured by Alma Dolens, whose speeches at the Stockholm Peace Congress last autumn delighted everybody.

The Moral Issue Involved in War.

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

Address delivered at the Conference of the American Society for Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, New Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., Thursday, December 15, 1910.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have listened with deep interest to the speeches which have been delivered here to-night, and have realized more than ever the importance of the work of this society. We must get a code of international law. [Applause.]

I have placed within reach of the chairman a fund that may be contributory to the success of this great work. [Applause.] But I am not to speak to you upon law to-night. Circumstances prevented me from following the law, and so I attached myself assiduously to the profits. [Laughter.] You have only to spell that in the simplified spelling which I have adopted, and which others must soon adopt, in order to understand my position. [Laughter.]

Ladies and gentlemen, I am persuaded that, costly as war is,—and the way that cost is increasing is ominous,—enormous as may be the expense of building ships for war, and the still greater expense of maintaining those ships when there is no war,—and seventy per cent. of all your taxation in this country is spent on war or pensions connected with war,—I am persuaded that it will not be from that great expenditure that we shall reach the state which we are rapidly approaching and are bound to reach, the abolition of war. [Applause.] We must appeal to the masses upon the moral issue involved in war. [Applause.]

The demagogue knows full well that he has only to arouse the passions of the people against another nation, to obtain votes for enormous expenditures for the so-called honor of his country. "Our country, right or wrong" is still a potent cry, its "honor" a sacred cause, and well do the demagogues understand this. This is the kind of patriotism which Johnson said was the refuge of scoundrels, and so it is to-day the refuge of scurvy politicians. [Applause.]

We must look above the mere money cost of war in order to effect its abandonment. As long as the yearly increase of the national wealth of the chief nations of the world is so incredibly great, we are above the question of the money cost. Great Britain is supposed to increase in national wealth every year \$4,000,000,000. You know what our own census tells us about America. It is not war itself that is the most expensive, because war seldom happens; it is the danger of war, which hangs like a dark cloud over the whole atmosphere of the world, that we must dread. No, gentlemen, means will always be forthcoming for war.

The great crime in war is that man kills man, made in the image of God, and we must bring the masses up to that point that they may understand that war is not simply a wrong, that it is not a stimulating element for the vigor of the race, but that it is the great crime of civilization, the killing of men by men like wild beasts. [Applause.]

Fortunately no custom has received such unstinted denunciation as war. From ancient times, long before Christ, it has been held up to us as "the foulest fiend ever vomited forth from hell," and age after age words of similar import have come from the masters and leaders

of men. Our own times echo these outbursts. Washington's first wish was that war should be abolished. When Grant was in London the Duke of Cambridge offered him a military review, and his answer was, "I never wish to look upon a regiment of soldiers again." He was a soldier not by choice; he left civil life at the call of duty to defend the Republic. But the words of General Sherman are the shortest and sum it all up, "War is hell." And that is what we must impress upon people if we wish to get the masses with us so enthusiastically that they will not permit it; or, to put it in another form, where they will sustain such statesmen as Elihu Root, author of twenty-four treaties of arbitration — present with us to-night — or our present Secretary of War, who is doing all he can in the good cause. These men will be sustained whenever you have the masses behind them believing that war is a crime. [Applause.]

It was the moral side of slavery, men buying and selling men and women, which finally brought about its abolition. And so I believe it will be with war. When Lincoln, then a young man, went to New Orleans in a trading boat on the Mississippi, and first witnessed the spectacle of men and women bought and sold, he said to his companion as he walked away, "If I ever get a chance I will hit this accursed thing hard." [Applause.] Aroused by that crime, he lived to emancipate the slaves. Would the world had another Lincoln to abolish the greatest of all remaining crimes! [Applause.]

We must press home to the masses in civilized lands the fact that man, notwithstanding all his savagery in early times, has within him the capacity for infinite upward progress. Of course we all know that man rose from the brute. If man had been created perfect but with the instinct for his own degradation, our task would be hopeless indeed; but man was created with the sublime capacity of ascending, his face ever to the sun, to higher and higher attainments, and there is no limit to his perfection, even in this earth. Such is man! [Applause.] This truth is what will lead man to faith in a divine power more swiftly and more surely than any other fact that human life has to record.

Now we must press home to the masses the fact that man, notwithstanding all his original savagery, has constantly been engaged in abolishing savage customs connected with war, one after another, for centuries. It is preposterous for scholars to stand up and preach that because man did savage things when he was a savage, he is going to continue war when he has become civilized. [Applause.]

For centuries we have been lessening the horrors of war. We no longer eat our fellows. Men did that once. Are we to go back to cannibalism? According to the theory of some gentlemen, that is what we might expect; because we did it once, therefore we are going to do it again. In other words, it is not logical to expect that God has created man so that he will go backward to savagery, when all the evidence of history is that from the day when knowledge was first preserved, so that we can read the record of the past, his course has been ever upward. [Applause.] Do not look to the past, but to the future. There is the hope we have that man shall rise to perfection. We no longer eat our fellows, or torture prisoners to death, or sack cities, putting the inhabitants to sword and flame. Remember that all these things

were once in consonance with the rules of war. The Duke of Wellington sacked cities in Spain, but we have done away with all that. Yet we still retain the killing of each other like wild beasts in this the twentieth century of the Christian era. It is a positive disgrace to humanity, and it is a crime against God. [Applause.] It was the moral crime of slavery which brought its abolition. So it will be with war. [Applause.]

Reference has been made here to-night to the German Emperor. I have a high opinion of him, but, being human, he has his failings, as we all have. If I had been born emperor of Germany, I, too, might have seen the great wisdom displayed in the choice, as he does. [Laughter.] He is the Lord's anointed in his own belief. I remember a little incident in Scotch history about the Lord's anointed. In the days of John Knox Andrew Melville was chairman of the committee that went to the King to assure him that in all his constitutional rights he would be sustained by the presbytery. The King, who "never said a foolish thing and never did a wise one," exclaimed: "Presbytery! Presbytery agrees with monarchy as the devil with holy water. Sir, you believe that you can assail the Lord's anointed." And Andrew Melville shook the King by his mantle, exclaiming, "The Lord's anointed! Man, you are only the Lord's silly vassal!" But very likely none of us would think the Emperor was only the Lord's silly vassal if we had been born emperor. [Laughter.]

The Emperor is to be extolled for his successful efforts to restrict private war in the army and navy. When he acceded to the throne the average of fatal duels in Germany was twelve hundred a year. They do not to-day amount to twelve. Why? Because he has appointed that a court of honor shall sit before a dangerous duel is fought, and only after that court has decided that it is inevitable can that duel take place. He has arranged also that it shall be fought with swords, which are really so innocent in the hands of the people who use them that the duel is becoming something of a farce in France. Now that is what the Emperor of Germany is doing, and in this he is doing good peace work at the root of the tree of international war. Because, if you banish private war, you are on the highway to abolishing it for men in general, and I applaud him highly for this. He has never waged war; his hands are guiltless of shedding blood. I believe him to be zealously for the peace of the world. He is a very religious man and often preaches sermons to his crew on the yacht. He urges young men to lead sober lives. Indeed, recently he was so urgent upon this point that he had to explain that in the army and navy a glass of grog might be useful after undue exposure. He is an undoubted power for good.

But that is not all. Let me remind you that the Lutheran Church denies Christian burial to one killed in a duel. Here we see the religious and moral influence doing its work against the crime of killing or wounding men made in the image of God.

Reference has been made this evening to the peace foundation, organized yesterday. I trust and believe, gentlemen of this judicial association, you will not fail to give it a warm welcome. [Applause.] I am sure cordial coöperation with you and with all other peace agencies in every possible way is ardently desired by it. [Applause.] While each has its own sphere, its special

mission, we should coöperate as fellow workers in the one grand army of peace, privileged to labor in the grandest of all causes, declaring with Washington that our first wish is that war should be abolished from the face of the earth.

Why the Panama Canal Should Not Be Fortified, but Neutralized.

The following resolution was adopted by the Board of Directors of the American Peace Society at their meeting January 3, and copies of it sent to Congress and given to the press of the country :

"Resolved, That the American Peace Society regards the fortification of the Panama Canal as unnecessary, in view of the Hague convention forbidding the bombardment of unfortified coast places, as involving a vast outlay of money needed for the material and moral uplift of our citizens, and as committing the United States to a program of increased military expenditure at a time when we ought to be leading the world in the effort to settle all international disputes by arbitration. We believe that neutralization by international agreement, as in the case of the unfortified Suez Canal, will give us ample guarantee of security, will be an important step towards the neutralization of all international water-ways, and will give the United States a moral leadership in the world-wide movement towards the removal of national misunderstandings and the fostering of international goodwill.

"Resolved, That we call upon all friends of peace to urge immediately upon their Representatives in Congress the passage of a bill for the neutralization of the canal under international guarantee."

Reasons why the Canal Should Not Be Fortified.

The following document, bearing the endorsement of Hon. Richard Olney, ex-Secretary of State, Francis Lynde Stetson, George C. Holt, Judge United States District Court, William D. Howells, Ida M. Tarbell, Alden Chester, ex-Justice Supreme Court, New York, Jane Addams, Marcus M. Marks, President National Association of Clothiers, Samuel B. Capen, President A. B. C. F. M., Bishop C. P. Anderson, N. O. Nelson, George Foster Peabody, Henry Wade Rogers, Dean of Yale Law School, David Starr Jordan, President of Leland Stanford University, W. H. P. Faunce, President of Brown University, Thomas Mott Osborne, and many others, was issued on January 16, and copies of it sent to every member of Congress :

"Neutralization means mutual agreement among nations that a specified region shall be always neutral in a war between other states, and that its own immunity from attack or from warlike action of belligerents be guaranteed.

"The Panama Canal should not be fortified :

"1. *Because* the canal would be safer in wartime without fortification. According to the agreement signed by the Hague Conference in 1907, unfortified coast places cannot be bombarded.

"2. *Because* the original intention of our government, as distinctly expressed in 1900, and previously, was to prohibit fortifications on the canal. Though this prohibition was omitted in the finally revised Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, signed in 1902, this in no wise implies that we ought to fortify it, nor was its construction proposed as primarily a military undertaking.

"3. *Because*, though the Suez Canal was built with English money, England agreed to its neutralization. The Straits of Magellan are also neutralized, and the

Interparliamentary Union in 1910 declared in favor of the neutralization of all interoceanic waterways.

"4. *Because* the United States in all its history has never been attacked, and began every foreign war it ever had, and is too important a customer for any great nation at this late day to wantonly attack. Though an enemy might in stress of war be tempted to break its pledge with us, no nation would dare break its neutralization pledge with the combined powers, as the penalty of non-intercourse, which could be included in the general treaty, would involve commercial ruin.

5. *"Because*, with the experience of nearly a century's peace with England, insured by our undefended Canadian border line, *until we have asked for complete arbitration treaties with all possible future enemies and have been refused*, we should be insincere in increasing our war measures. This is especially true in view of the facts that since 1902 the nations have signed one hundred arbitration treaties, and President Taft has made the impressive declaration that he sees no reason why any question whatever should not be arbitrated; that the second Hague Conference in various ways diminished the likelihood of war; that not only the Prize Court, but the Court of Arbitral Justice, is practically assured; and that in the summer of 1910 Congress unanimously passed a resolution asking the President to appoint a commission of five to consider the utilization of existing agencies to limit the armaments of the world by mutual agreement of the nations and to constitute the world navies 'an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider other means to diminish expenditures for military purposes.'

6. *"Because*, in the words of Hon. David J. Foster, chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives: 'The initial expense of the necessary fortifications would not be less than \$25,000,000; in all probability it would not be less than \$50,000,000. The annual expense of maintaining such fortifications two thousand miles from home would probably amount to \$5,000,000. . . . With all the fortifications possible, it is still apparent that, in order that the canal might be of military advantage to the United States in time of war, a guard of battleships at each of its entrances would be an absolute necessity. It is equally apparent that with such a guard the fortifications would be unnecessary, if not entirely useless. . . . We are bound by solemn treaty obligations to see to it that the canal shall be, and remain forever, open to British ships in time of war as well as in time of peace; and while it is probably true that no other nation could claim any advantage by virtue of this treaty, it is also true that we have thereby placed ourselves under moral obligation to maintain an open canal for the ships of all nations at all times, in war as well as in peace.'

Cooper Union Resolution.

At the close of the meeting held in Cooper Union, New York, on January 13, under the auspices of the New York Peace Society and the People's Institute, and addressed by Hon. David J. Foster and Hon. James A. Tawney, the following resolution, addressed to President Taft, was adopted and forwarded to him and also afterwards to all the members of Congress :

"In view of the fact that the civilized world is united today as never before, by reason of quick transmission of news,